

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04245 072109Z

66

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 MC-02

/090 W

----- 120577

R 071847Z AUG 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 3052

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 4245

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJECT: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC DISCUSSION AUGUST 7

REFS: A. USNATO 3970 DTG 291355Z JUL 75

B. USNATO 3985 DTG 291832Z JUL 75

C. USNATO 3982 DTG 291735Z JUL 75

D. UNSATO 4096 DTG 051253Z AUG 75

E. STATE 182853

F. STATE 182850

G. VIENNA 9650 DTG NOV 73

1. SPC ON AUGUST 7 MET ON THE DRAFT GUIDANCE AND DRAFT SUPPLEMENT ON OPTION III. REFERENCES TO THESE DRAFT DOCUMENTS IN THIS MESSAGE ARE TO THE VERSIONS TRANSMITTED RES A, B AND CM WE SHALL TRANSMIT REVISED TEXTS, EMBODYING CHANGES SINCE TRANSMISSION OF REFS A, B AND C BY SEPTEL.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 04245 072109Z

2. FRG REP (BOSS) STATED THAT BONN COULD NOT ACCEPT THE DUTCH LANGUAGE; PROPOSED AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING FOR INSERTION IN PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE AND PARA 3(BIS) OF THE SUPPLEMENT (PARA2, REF D), (COMMENT: THAT WAS THE LANGUAGE WHICH SOUGHT TO LEAVE

OPEN THE POSSIBILITY OF FURTHER REDUCTIONS OF NUCLEAR ELEMENTS OR NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT IN PHASE II.) HE DID NOT ELUCIDATE. UK REP (BAILES) SAID THAT LONDON ALSO COULD NOT ACCEPT THE DUTCH LANGUAGE.

THE UK BELIEVING THE DUTCH LANGUAGE WOULD GIVE THE OTHER SIDE A "STRING TO PULL" IN PRESSING THE WEST ON ARMAMENTS REDUCTIONS. THE DUTCH LANGUAGE WOULD PREJUDICE THE KEY QUESTION IT SOUGHT TO LEAVE OPEN. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES FEEL VERY STRONGLY ON THIS POINT, AND ARE UNLIKELY TO ACCEPT DELETION OF THE PHRASE THEY HAVE PROPOSED.

3. DANISH REP (VILLADSEN) ON PERSONAL BASIS SUPPORTED US REFERENCE IN PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE TO CONCENTRATING ON "GROUND FORCES", AND OPPOSED THE FRG REFERENCE TO "GROUND FORCE MANPOWER". THE FORMER WAS THE ALLIED POSITION AND FRG CONCERN ABOUT ARMAMENTS REDUCTIONS IS MET IN THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE. FRG REP REITERATED FRG WISH TO UNDERLINE THROUGH THIS LANGUAGE THAT OPTION III DID NOT CHANGE MBFR INTO A NEGOTIATION ON ARMAMENTS. (FRG IS SUPPORTED ONLY BY ITALY ON THIS LANGUAGE.)

4. FRG REP AND UK REP BOTH SAID THEIR AUTHORITIES AGREE WITH THE US VIEWS STATED AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING (PARAS 1 A-C, REF E) ON THE BELGIAN " MINIMALIST POSITION ON CEILINGS AND CONSTRAINTS.

5. FRG REP QUESTIONED THE US VIEW, EXPRESSED AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING, THAT THE US VERSION OF PARAS 4-9 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE OFFERED THE AHG MORE FLEXIBILITY IN PRESENTING CEILINGS ISSUES TO THE OTHER SIDE. US REP (PEREZ) REITERATED THE ADVANTAGES IN US VERSION IN RELATING LIMITS ON SOVIET TANKS TO LIMITS ON NUCLEAR ELEMENTS (PARA 2, REF F), AND NOTED RIGID FRG SCENARIO RE US TANKS AND SOVIET NUCLEAR ELEMENTS. UK REP SAID LONDON HAD REAFFIRMED ITS SUPPORT FOR THE US VERSION OF PARAS 4-9. ALTHOUGH HER AUTHORITIES HAD NOT SPECIFICALLY COMMENTED ON THE FRG VERSION OF THESE PARAS, IT WAS CLEAR THAT THE US VERSION CREATES MORE OF A SEPARATION BETWEEN TANKS AND NUCLEAR ELEMENTS, AND OFFERS AHG MORE FLEXIBILITY IN PRESENTATION.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 04245 072109Z

6. UK REP NOTED THAT THE US AT THE PREVIOUS MEETING HAD CRITICIZED THE UK SECOND AND THIRD BRACKETED PHRASES IN PARA 7 OF THE US VERSION OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. THE UK DID NOT CONSIDER THE MEANING OF THESE PHRASES TO BE MUCH DIFFERENT FROM THE ORIGINAL US LANGUAGE AND THEREFORE THE UK WAS WILLING TO DROP THE TWO PHRASES. HOWEVER, THE UK CONTINUED TO MAINTAIN PARA 8(BIS) OF THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENT. THE LATTER PARA REPRESENTS THE STRONGLY HELD UK VIEW ON DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN LIMITATIONS IMPLIED BY EXISTING ALLIED PHASE I PROPOSAL, AND LIMITATIONS ARISING FROM OPTION III. SHE CALLED ATTENTION TO PARAS 2 AND 3 OF UK PAPER ON CEILINGS. FRG REP STATED THAT BONN AGREED WITH US THAT PARA 8(BIS) OF THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENT SHOULD BE DELETED.

7. FRG REP NOTED THAT FRG HAD PROPOSED AT PREVIOUS MEETING AMENDING PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE TO PROVIDE THAT THE 29,000 US FORCES AND THE SOVIET TANK ARMY WITHDRAWN IN PHASE I SHOULD RETURN TO HOMELANDS. HE NOTED THAT US REP HAD QUESTIONED INCLUSION OF THIS POINT

THE SECOND AND THIRD TCS OF PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, ON GROUNDS THAT THOSE TICS WERE LABELED AS PROPOSALS ALREADY MADE TO THE OTHER SIDE, AND ON GROUND THAT THE POINT WAS ALREADY MADE IN THE SUPPLEMENT HE ASKED IF THE ALLIES WOULD NOT WISH TO MAKE THAT POINT TO THE OTHER SIDE AT THE OUTSET.

8. COMMENT: FRG'S SPECIFIC SUGGESTION FOR AMENDING THE SECOND AND THIRD TICS OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE WAS TO INSERT AFTER "REDUCTIONS" IN THE SECOND TIC THE PHRASE "TO THE UNITED STATES," AND TO INSERT AFTER "REDUCTIONS" IN THE THIRD TIC THE PHRASE "TO THE USSR". WE NOTE THAT THE ALLIED FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL OF NOVEMBER 20, 1973, (PO/73/154) DID NOT SPECIFICALLY STATE THIS ALLIED POSITION TO THE EAST, ALTHOUGH IT SEEMS IMPLICIT IN THE SECOND PARA OF PARA 7 OF THAT DOCUMENT. THE LANGUAGE IN PARA 13 OF THE US REP'S STATEMENT OF NOVEMBER 22, 1973 (REF G) IS CLEARER ON THIS POINT, AND SIMILAR LANGUAGE HAS BEEN USED WITH THE EAST SINCE THAT TIME. ACTION REQUESTED: CAN WASHINGTON ACCEPT THE AMENDMENT TO PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE SUGGESTED BY THE FRG?

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 04245 072109Z

9. SPC, AS PREVIOUSLY REPORTED, WILL RECESS THE WEEKS OF AUGUST 11 AND AUGUST 18. THE NEXT SPC MEETING ON OPTION III WILL BE ON MONDAY, AUGUST 25. STREATOR

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 07 AUG 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: izenbei0
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO04245
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750897/abbrzljx.tel
Line Count: 146
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USNATO 3970 DTG 291355Z JUL 75 B. USNATO 3985 DTG 291832Z JUL 75 C. USNATO 3982 DTG 291735Z JUL 75 D.
UNSATO 4096 DTG 051253Z AUG 75 E. STATE 182853 F. STATE 182850
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: izenbei0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 07 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <07 APR 2003 by Izenbel0>; APPROVED <24 SEP 2003 by izenbei0>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC DISCUSSION AUGUST 7
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
AMEMBASSY
USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006